DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 316 501 SP 031 818

AUTHOR DeBolt, Gary P.
TITLE Helpful Elements in the Mentoring of First Year Teachers. A Report to the State Education Department on the New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program for 1988-1989.
PUB DATE Aug 89
NOTE 32p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teacher Induction; Beginning Teachers; Delphi Technique; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Mentors; Program Development; Program Evaluation; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Orientation
IDENTIFIERS *New York State Mentor Teacher Internship Program

ABSTRACT

This study attempted to elicit and organize the experience of 164 teachers who had served as mentors of novice teachers in the third year of the New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program. The three basic aspects of the mentoring experience investigated were: (1) the characteristics of individual mentors; (2) the activities of mentoring; and (3) the elements of organizational structure. In order to reach consensus regarding the elements reported to be helpful to mentoring, a modified form of the Delphi Techniques was used. Participants first responded to a three-part questionnaire composed of the characteristics, activities, and element of organizational structure developed from the literature. A second questionnaire was developed from the responses to round one, and respondents were asked to rate each of 88 items in terms of its helpfulness in mentoring in general. The third questionnaire further narrowed and refined the responses. An analysis is presented of the responses to the final round. Highest ranked in the final responses on characteristics of mentors was approachability; in activities with the intern, the term encouraging was most often used; and effective pre-planning was ranked the most important factor in overall project structure. Implications for policy makers at the state and school district level are discussed. Data from the three rounds of questionnaires are displayed in tables. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED316501

A Report

to the

State Education Department

on the

New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program

for

1988-1989

HELPFUL ELEMENTS IN THE MENTORING OF FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

prepared by

Dr. Gary P. DeBolt
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
and Reading
SUNY - Geneseo

August, 1989

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. P. DeBolt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP 031 818

A Report

to the

State Education Department

on the

New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program

for

1988-1989

HELPFUL ELEMENTS IN THE MENTORING OF FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

prepared by

Dr. Gary P. DeBolt
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and Reading
SUNY - Geneseo

August, 1989

Preface

This report is one of a series of reports issued in conjunction with the statewide evaluation of the New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program. It is based on data collected and analyzed in the third year of the Program, 1988-1989. It is intended to focus attention on one of the aspects of the Program that has been judged critical to understanding and making decisions regarding the Program or one of the local projects it sponsors. The entire series of reports should be read to develop an understanding of the Program as a whole and to place each report in perspective.

Dr. Gerald M. Mager
Statewide Evaluator,
NYS MT-I Program
Syracuse University

Introduction

Recently, educators in New York State have been actively involved in attempts to improve the induction into teaching process. One avenue for these efforts has been the Mentor Teacher-Internship (MT-I) Program. There exists a lack of consensus in the literature regarding the nature of mentoring, and a lack of widely accepted guidelines to help planners of mentoring programs develop strategies to provide atmospheres in which mentoring would be encouraged and nurtured. This led to a dissertation study aimed at developing an empirically based description of elements helpful in the mentoring of first-year teachers. The study, conducted during 1988-1989, was an attempt to elicit and to organize the experiences of a large group of teachers who had served as mentors of novice teachers. The three basic aspects of the mentoring experience investigated were:

(1) the characteristics of individual mentors

(2) the activities of mentoring

(3) the elements of organizational structure

that were helpful in the mentoring of first-year teachers. These aspects were studied to develop consensus among the mentors regarding the specific elements that were thought to be helpful in the process of mentoring.

Review of the Literature

The literature on mentoring of first-year teachers is growing. Many states have adopted some form of support, which they have variously called mentoring, as part of their local or statewide induction programs. A common characteristic among these programs is their vague and often unique definitions of the term mentor and/or mentoring (Anderson and Shannon, 1988; Thies-Sprinthall, 1986; Gray and Gray, 1985).

Studies exist which have focused on informal mentoring among teachers (Gehrhe and Kay, 1984; Egan, 1985) and of formalized mentoring among teachers (Krupp, 1984; Little, Galagaran, and O'Neil, 1984; Huling-Austin, Barnes, and Smith, 1985; and Showers, 1982). Collectively, this literature does not contain an empirically based description of mentoring. They do contain theoretically based descriptions. These are very important in the efforts of educators to better understand the process of mentoring to support beginning teachers. However, at some point, they must be confirmed empirically, modified on the basis of empirical knowledge, or rejected.

A further study of the literature resulted in three lists of items which might be helpful in the mentoring of first-year teachers. A detailed account of this process is recounted in DeBolt (1989). These three lists formed the essence of the first questionnaire of this study.

Method

In order to reach consensus regarding the elements reported to be helpful to mentoring, a modified form of The Delphi Technique was used. This research method was chosen because of its potential to reach consensus by iteration of questionnaires among a geographically diverse group of mentors.

Basically, the method used involved five steps:

(1) a three-part questionnaire composed of characteristics, activities, and elements of organizational structure was developed from the literature on mentoring;

(2) the questionnaire was sent to 164 mentors to obtain their reactions, based on their experience, and to allow them to add items that they felt were missing from the questionnaire;

(3) a second questionnaire was developed from the responses to Round I and sent to respondents asking them to rate, based on their expertise, each of the 88 items in terms of the item's helpfulness in mentoring in general;

(4) a third questionnaire was developed from the results of the responses to Round II and was mailed to respondents asking them to reconsider their response to each item in relation to the group response to each item and, in some cases, a sample rationale given by a mentor; and,

(5) the responses to the final round were analyzed to form the output of the study.

Application of The Delphi Technique

The Delphi Technique provided a reasonable and practical method for conducting a large scale study of the elements reported to be helpful in mentoring by experienced mentors who had been participants in New York State's Mentor Teacher-Intern Program during the 1987-1988 school year. This study utilized experienced mentors from across New York State. Their participation in this study was voluntary.

A modified form of The Delphi Technique was chosen as the method used in this study. Adaptation of this research tool allowed the study to incorporate items or rationale noted by the participants. It afforded an opportunity to systematically gather information based on the personal experiences of mentors and their beliefs regarding what factors are helpful in mentoring as a relatively new endeavor in education. The method employed a modification of The Delphi because the first instrument was used to collect data about the mentors' experience, while the second and third instruments changed the focus to obtain important ratings based on the mentors' expertise.

The method was modified in these ways in order to avoid some of the criticisms of other Delphi studies. By allowing the mentors to add items to the study, this modification gave the participants a considerable amount of input. This represented an attempt to use the method more to discover what the participants thought rather than to force them to move toward a consensus. Round I sought to collect information about the mentors' actual experiences; while, Rounds II and III sought to make use of the mentors' expertise, or special knowledge, to rate the helpfulness of items that might affect mentoring of first-year teachers in general.

This study sought to use all available mentors in the MT-I Program as a way to avoid problems with sampling. By beginning with the entire group of available mentors, the mentors themselves determined who the participants in this study would be. This does introduce the issue of volunteer bias. However, it was decided that this was the more desirable alternative. The original questionnaire was pilot-tested in order to improve clarity. Attempts were made to use systematic procedures of coding and aligning addresses, codes and responses in order to ensure proper organization of the data. The Delphi procedure itself was an attempt to engage mentors from across New York State in an organized consideration of things helpful to mentoring. As such, it served to bring them into indirect contact with other mentors in hopes of bridging the isolation in which teachers often work. Their participation in this study was essential. Their input was specific.

This process of discovering existing agreement must not necessarily imply that the consensus will be, or ought to be, the correct and most desired conceptualization of mentoring; and, therefore, dictate its form and universal application in the future. Even though such a conceptualization

might be seen as being most valid, the process helped to identify, and by contrast and comparison, clarify other more divergent points of view.

Subjects

The 164 mentors, directly accessible by mail to the researcher, who participated in the New York State MT-I Program during the 1987-1988 school-year, were chosen as the target population of this study. Taken as a group, these mentors represented 28 of the 29 projects funded by New York State in 1987-1988. The mentors of the remaining district were not made directly accessible to the researcher due to the decision of their school district; therefore, they were not included in this study. Inclusion of all available 164 mentors was an attempt to broaden the empirical base of the study and to maximize the number of respondents for the final round. These experienced mentors were selected as the population of experts based on the following criteria:

(1) They were all experienced mentors, having served as mentors for one or two years.

(2) They had demonstrated interest in mentoring. This was evidenced by the fact that they had to volunteer to be selected as a mentor.

(3) Each was selected by their local project committee to serve as a mentor. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that they were judged to have some qualities that would enable them to serve as mentors.

(4) They were judged by their project's selection committee to meet the criteria established by the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education Section 207 and 3033 of The Education Law, and Chapter 748 of the Laws of 1987, of which Section 85.1 gave the following definition of mentor:

> Mentor shall mean a teacher who is permanently certified in the same area of certificate title as the intern, or permanently licensed in the same license area as the intern, and who has demonstrated his or her mastery of pedagogical and subject matter skills, given evidence of superior teaching abilities and interpersonal relationship qualities, and has indicated willingness to participate by being a mentor in an approved mentor teacher-internship program. Each teacher designated as a mentor shall continue to provide classroom instruction for at least 60 percent of the time spent in performance of such individual's duties during the school year, except that a teacher may serve as a mentor on a full-time basis for not more than two years out of five consecutive school years. In the event that a school district or board of cooperative educational services demonstrates to the satisfaction of the commissioner that an appropriately certified mentor is not available, a teacher permanently certified or licensed in a different area of certificate title or license area than that of the intern, may serve as a mentor. Service as a mentor shall not result in any change in the mentor's tenure area or areas, and shall not otherwise diminish or impair the tenure and seniority rights of the mentor teacher.
>
> (Corsi, 1986, p. 3)

Conducting the Study

Round I. During the last week in September, 1988, the Round I questionnaire was mailed to all 164 mentors who were part of the NYS MT-IP Evaluation Study during the 1987-1988 school year. The questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter (Appendix A in the dissertation) outlining the nature of the study, the organization of the questionnaire and the importance

of participation by each mentor. Participants were asked to complete the form and return it within ten days.

Of the 164 questionnaires mailed in September, 2 were returned and marked "unable to deliver". Ninety-eight of the remaining 162 mentors (approximately 60 percent) responded to the questionnaire within the time limits. Responses were tallied.

Round II. The questionnaire for Round II was developed from the responses to Round I. Based on the suggestions of the mentors, additional items were added to the original lists in each section of the questionnaire.

The second round questionnaire (Appendix B in the dissertation) was reorganized to reflect the first round responses, and refocused from the experience of the mentors to their expertise. Whereas the mentors had been asked previously to consider each item in light of their personal experiences as mentors, in Round II they were asked to shift their perspective and to consider each item as it would be helpful to mentoring in general in an ideal context. The mentors were asked to judge each item even if it had not been a part of their personal experiences.

Respondents were asked to rate each item using a nine-point Likert scale. Items on the rating scale were labeled as follows:

Least Helpful	Moderately Helpful	Most Helpful
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9

An item judged to be least helpful would be indicated by circling 1, 2, or 3 depending on how intensely the mentor felt about the particular item. In similar fashion, a rating of 4, 5, or 6 would indicate that the mentor judged an item to be moderately helpful; while a 7, 8, or 9 would indicate an item to be most helpful to the mentor. It was thought that a nine-point scale would allow for a sufficient range of responses.

At the bottom of each section, respondents were asked to choose the two items they rated the highest and to explain their thinking related to the helpfulness of each item.

Ninety-eight questionnaires for Round II were mailed on October 14. Mentors were asked to respond and return the questionnaire within two weeks. Sixty-five responses to Round II were received within the two week time limit. This represented approximately 66 percent of the questionnaires mailed; and approximately 40 percent of the original mailing of 162.

Responses were systematically organized by item and analyzed to produce a group mean and standard deviation for each item. Items were then placed in descending order by group means within each of the five parts of the three sections of the questionnaire. Rationale statements at the end of each section were also recorded and summarized.

Round III. From the results of Round II, a new format was developed for Round III of this study. A necessity for space in which to report information to the participants dictated a move to six pages.

The final questionnaire (Appendix C in the dissertation) was constructed to provide several pieces of information to the participants for their consideration. This information included:

(1) The items from Round II reorganized in descending order based on the group mean of all responses to that item in Round II.

(2) The group mean for each item.

(3) The standard deviation of all responses for each item. It was indicated that the smaller this number, the greater the agreement among respondents.

(4) The individual mentor's response (1-9) to each item from Round II.

(5) Sometimes a sample rationale stating why the item was thought to be helpful to mentoring was reported in the words of the panelist who had written it as a response to Round II. Selection of these items was based on a subjective evaluation of its representative value. An example of this selection process was the selection of the statement to be used for "having informal discussions" under "Activities with the Intern". Fourteen statements were received for this item. Several responses noted this as a time to deal with important issues. Others described it as a time to work together in a non-threatening way. Therefore, a comment which included both of these ideas was chosen: "Important issues can be dealt with in a friendly atmosphere." In twelve cases, no rationale were given and, therefore, none were included for those items.

(6) The same scale (1-9) for rating each item was used for reporting the final rating of each panelist for each item.

Respondents were asked to provide a final rating for each item on the third questionnaire after they had considered the information provided from other respondents. In addition, for each respondent, items on which the response was determined to lie out of the range of one standard deviation were highlighted in yellow, and respondents were asked to consider their responses in light of that fact. Mentors had the option of changing their responses or not changing them. If they chose not to change their response from Round II to the final rating, then they were asked to use the space at the end of each section to explain their rationale for their position.

Participants were also asked to sign the last sheet of their questionnaire if they would grant permission for their names to be listed as panelists in this study (Appendix B). Sixty-five questionnaires for Round III were mailed and the participants were asked to return them within two weeks.

Forty-eight of the 65 questionnaires mailed in Round III were completed and returned within the time limit. This represented approximately 74 percent of the questionnaires mailed for Round III; and, approximately 30 percent of the original 162 questionnaires delivered in Round I. This response rate was very respectable when the amount of time and effort required of participants was taken into consideration. The response rate also seemed good when considered in light of response rates of other Delphi studies. For example, a recent Delphi study by Heath, Neimeyer and Pedersen (1988) involved only two rounds, yet it noted a response rate of 40 percent.

Responses to Round III were analyzed to determine group mean and standard deviation in order to compare these responses to those obtained in Round II. The responses to the final questionnaire were reorganized in descending order based on the group mean responses from Round III. This resulted in an ordering of items in each section of the questionnaire which represented the degree to which this group of experienced mentors found each item to be helpful to the mentoring of first-year teachers. The standard deviations could be interpreted as the degree of consensus regarding the helpfulness of each item among the respondents.

The results of these three rounds and their content were analyzed and summarized to produce the results of this study. (See Appendix A for tables summarizing these data.)

Discussion of Data

This study collected data which have been organized in each of the three sections (five parts) according to the means of the ratings of the experienced mentors who participated in it. Together with the comments and rationale provided by participants, these data provide a basis on which to respond to the research question upon which this study was designed: What are the elements identified by experienced mentor teachers that are helpful in the mentoring of first-year teachers?

In Round I, mentors indicated that most of the items identified from the literature had been helpful in their experience. This confirms that most of the items discussed in the literature were helpful in the experience of the participants of this study. It also suggests that the experiences of mentors in New York were somewhat similar to those of mentors elsewhere.

This study was set in the context of one state's formalized use of mentors to support first-year teachers. New York State's program involved guidelines which fostered certain similarities among all the diverse school-based projects. In acknowledging these points, it seems that the experiences of mentors in New York are worthy of consideration in the study of mentoring in general.

It was interesting to note that the two characteristics of mentors which received the lowest number of "Yes" responses were ability to take criticism and autonomy. This may appear as an indicator of the widely held principle of egalitarianism (everyone's beliefs or practices are of equal value) among teachers in which they are not used to accepting criticism since so much in teaching is viewed as being a matter of personal choice and style. It may also point to the existence of a belief that the mentor does not have to be able to take criticism; only to give it.

The second item may reflect the lack of autonomy experienced by most teachers. Autonomy is an issue that has come to the front in the wake of recent reform movements. New York State is beginning to deal with it under the label of "shared decision-making". The data from this study suggest that not all experienced teachers view autonomy as part of their experience in their work as mentors.

Data gathered in this study suggest that holding formal discussions and teaching together were not part of the experiences of many mentors. These data raise some interesting questions. Should our projects be formal or informal in their approach to organization? Mentors did not rate activities engaged in without the intern as highly as activities done with the intern. The only joint activities rated lower than activities engaged in without the intern were teaching the intern and social events. Should we plan for more informal time and less structure?

On the other hand, the highest rated joint activities included encouraging, counseling, and modeling, which were derived from Anderson and Shannon's (1988) conceptualization of mentoring. This would seem to lend support to their conceptualization of mentoring as comprising essential attributes. These attributes were: the process of nurturing, the act of serving as a role model, the five mentoring functions (teaching, sponsoring, encouraging, counseling, and befriending), the focus on professional and/or personal development, and the ongoing caring relationship (Anderson and Shannon, 1988). The present study has provided some empirically based evidence for the helpfulness to mentoring of some of the attributes noted by Anderson and Shannon.

The data from Round I suggested that there existed a variety of experiences with other activities. Sixty-five percent of the respondents indicated

that attending national conferences did not come into play in their experiences. Forty-two percent reported they as mentors did not visit other schools. Twenty-five percent reported not having attended state or regional conferences. These are relatively significant percentages. Yet many others did report these activities as having been helpful. There exists a diversity of experiences among our group of respondents. This result reaffirms Noe's (1988) call for more studies to examine what a mentor does for (or with) an intern. We need to know more about the activities of mentoring and especially how these activities might be helpful in mentoring.

In Round III, the mentor training program was the highest rated among the list of other activities. It was followed closely by intern observing other teachers, and meeting other mentors. These items support the literature in this area.

The results of this study regarding elements of organizational structure point to the diversity of projects as they were operationalized across the State. There is some evidence to support Noe's (1988) claim that the characteristics of the program may be of importance to the success or failure of the mentor-intern relationship. Respondents to this study did rate certain elements of organizational structure to be helpful to mentoring. The findings of this study also concur with the listing of important aspects of program design suggested by Phillips-Jones (1983), and Thies-Sprinthall (1986). Certainly, the data relating to elements of overall project structure suggest that the elements listed were not experienced by everyone. It was interesting to note that not all elements indicated as having been absent from the experience of large numbers of mentors ended up being lowly rated in Round III. For example, although 35 percent of the respondents indicated that effective pre-planning for the project had not come into

play in their experience, this item was the highest rated item of this part of the study in Round III. This suggests that participants may have considered it to be an element of organizational structure that would be helpful in the future.

A comparison of the data for elements of project support for mentors from Round I and Round III revealed that although many respondents indicated that such elements had not come into play in their experiences, adequate release time, orientation for the mentors, and satisfactory substitute arrangements could be most helpful to mentors. Again, this reaffirms much of what is in the literature (Mager, 1988, April). These data help to point out some of the considerations that might be made in planning mentoring projects in the future.

Some of the items in this study were rated more highly than others. In attempting to better understand the data, it may be helpful to select certain pieces of the data for further consideration. For example, since the purpose of this study was to discover which items were helpful in mentoring, a 9-point scale was used. No item received a mean rating of higher than 8.7 in any round of the study. All the items which had a final mean rating of 8.0 or higher were culled from the data into three parallel lists. The purpose of these lists was to allow the reader to consider which items received the highest ratings in the final round. The lists were:

Characteristics of mentors	Activities of mentoring	Elements of Organizational Structure
approachability	encouraging	adequate release time
integrity	counselling	orientation for mentor
good listener	modeling	satisfactory substitute arrangement
sincerity	having informal discussions	effective pre-planning for the project
willingness to spend time	mentor training program	administrative support for the project
enthusiasm		
teaching competence		
trust		
receptivity		
willingness to work hard		
positive outlook		
confidence		
commitment to the profession		
openness		
experience in teaching		
tactfulness		
cooperativeness		
flexibility		

From these parallel lists, it can be said that:

1. Eighteen of the 36 characteristics of mentors received a mean rating of 8.0 or higher.
2. Two of the characteristics of mentors were the highest rated of all 88 items in the study.
3. Five out of the 27 activities had mean ratings of 8.0 or greater.
4. Five out of the 25 elements of organizational structure received mean ratings of 8.0 or greater.

Upon further review of the tables in Chapter IV in the dissertation, it may be noted that based on the 9-point scale used, 33 of the 36 characteristics of mentors, 11 of the 27 activities of mentoring and 18 of the 25 elements of organizational structure were rated most helpful.

The importance of these lists is not in the mean ratings per se, but rather in the number of characteristics of mentors which were highly rated by the mentors themselves. The mentors have made it clear that the characteristics of mentors are helpful to mentoring. Decision makers may be well served to consider the helpfulness of certain characteristics of the mentors themselves.

Collectively, participants in this study have emphasized the helpfulness of the personal and professional characteristics of mentors. This is in agreement with the work of many authors who have written about the characteristics of mentors, (Hoffman, et al., 1986; Mager, et al., 1987; and Galvez-Hjornevik, 1986) and is the opposite of the point argued by Clemson (1987). The highly rated characteristics of mentors have many similarities with Alleman's (1982) description of successful mentors.

Participants in this study emphasized the helpfulness of who the mentors are, as opposed to what mentors do or in what context they do it. This supports Mager's (1988, November) emphasis on the mentor-intern relationship and Zimpher and Rieger's (1988, August) call for the importance of selection criteria for mentors. It also agrees with the emphasis on the people involved in mentoring found in Gehrke and Kay (1984). Gehrke (1988, January) noted the unique qualities of mentors as mature, advanced and experienced master teachers. She also (1988, August) had used the metaphor of gift giving for mentoring. She calls for consideration that mentoring, like gift giving, involves a "spirit of the gift that is so lacking in the definitions and careful attempts at analysis of mentoring that fill the journals today." (p. 193) The emphasis on the characteristics of mentors by the participants of the current study may indicate a reason to investigate Gehrke's comments. More needs to be known about the giver as well as the act of gift giving. There may be a connection between the characteristics of the giver and the quality of the gift to be given.

Implications

State. New York State is approaching a critical decision in relation to the use of mentors in support of first-year teachers. The Commissioner of Education and the Board of Regents are considering action to mandate one-year internships as a requirement for permanent certification in New York State. It has been suggested that such an internship be closely supervised. One way of providing such supervision would be by using mentor teachers. This study organized a large number of mentors to share their expertise developed by experience. As such, it can inform policy-makers about elements that have been found to be helpful in mentoring. The results of this study suggest that policy-makers need to consider the importance of the quality of the mentor teacher. Experienced mentors have indicated that they place great emphasis on the helpfulness of personal and professional characteristics of mentors. It may be beneficial to consider these issues before legislating that a teacher can only mentor two of every five years. The quality of the mentors needs to be given careful consideration.

School District. School district personnel across New York State, and in other states, can be informed by the results of this study. The results can be used to more effectively select mentors (characteristics of mentors), plan and carry-out activities for mentors and interns (activities of mentoring) and design support strategies and systems (elements of organizational structure) for the mentoring of first-year teachers. These factors may be especially important if the anticipated demand for new teachers materializes in the next ten years. If districts experience a demand for new teachers, then they might be wise to invest in a program to support and develop the potential of those new teachers. Such a program would be in stark contrast to the all too familiar "sink or swim" approach to which new teachers have

been subjected in the past. Project planners might use the results of this study to help select mentors. Planners would have to consider the mentors' potential to perform successfully in the unique context(s) of their district.

The activities of mentoring detailed in this study could be very useful in planning activities which would be helpful to the support of their beginning teachers. And, the elements of organizational structure discussed herein could provide insight into aspects of their project design which can be helpful to their mentors. All of these data can inform planners who have to design a project for the first time. Such specific considerations will not only make design of the project, selection of the mentors, and support of the mentoring easier, but it will also provide a framework to monitor the progress of the project and to evaluate it at year's end.

There does not appear to exist a single-best model of a mentor nor of a mentor project. Each school will have to consider its unique set of contexts and resources. However, by making use of the results of this study, each school will be able to learn from the experience of the participants in this study. These participants have been pioneers in this relatively new venture. Educators should benefit from the wisdom gained by those who have gone before.

APPENDIX A

The five tables, included herein, present the results of mentors' responses in Round II and Round III.

Table 1
Characteristics of Mentors -- Comparison of the Results from Round II and Round III

Means ($\bar{X}$) and standard deviations (sd) from Round II and Round III.

Order	Item	RII $\bar{X}$	RII (sd)	RIII $\bar{X}$	RIII (sd)
1.	approachability *	8.4	(0.9)	8.7	(0.5)
2.	integrity	8.4	(1.0)	8.6	(0.8)
3.	good listener	8.3	(1.0)	8.5	(0.7)
4.	sincerity	8.1	(1.0)	8.4	(0.8)
5.	willingness to spend time	8.1	(1.0)	8.4	(0.8)
6.	enthusiasm	8.2	(1.0)	8.3	(0.8)
7.	teaching competence**	8.2	(1.1)	8.3	(0.8)
8.	trust	8.1	(1.2)	8.3	(0.9)
9.	receptivity	8.1	(1.2)	8.3	(0.7)
10.	willingness to work hard	8.1	(1.1)	8.3	(0.8)
11.	positive outlook	8.0	(1.1)	8.2	(0.8)
12.	confidence	7.8	(1.4)	8.2	(0.9)
13.	commitment to profession	8.1	(1.1)	8.2	(0.8)
14.	openness	7.9	(1.0)	8.1	(0.7)
15.	experience in teaching**	7.7	(1.4)	8.1	(0.8)
16.	tactfulness	7.8	(1.3)	8.0	(1.0)
17.	cooperativeness	8.0	(0.9)	8.0	(0.7)
18.	flexibility	7.9	(1.4)	8.0	(1.0)
19.	concern	7.9	(1.1)	7.9	(1.0)
20.	sense of humor	7.6	(1.4)	7.8	(1.1)
21.	organization**	7.7	(1.2)	7.8	(1.0)
22.	patience**	7.6	(1.2)	7.6	(0.9)
23.	empathy	7.3	(1.5)	7.6	(1.0)
24.	initiative	7.6	(1.4)	7.6	(1.6)
25.	reflectiveness on how people learn**	7.5	(1.3)	7.5	(0.9)
26.	consciously skilled**	7.4	(1.4)	7.5	(0.8)
27.	ability to take criticism	7.5	(1.2)	7.5	(1.0)
28.	candidness	7.1	(1.4)	7.4	(1.0)
29.	unselfishness**	7.1	(1.5)	7.3	(1.0)
30.	intelligence	7.2	(1.3)	7.3	(1.0)

31. **well educated****	7.0	(1.5)	7.2	(0.9)
32. **determination****	7.2	(1.4)	7.1	(0.9)
33. **knowledgeable about district****	7.1	(1.6)	7.1	(1.2)
34. autonomy	6.8	(1.8)	6.8	(1.2)
35. **knowledge of current research****	6.6	(1.7)	6.6	.4)
36. **humility****	6.5	(1.7)	6.6	(1.3)

Note: Round II (n=65)
Round III (n=48)

* Characteristics were placed in descending order according to the group means from Round III.

** Bold-faced type indicates the characteristics that were added by participants in Round I.

Table 2
Activities with the Intern -- Comparison of the Results from Round II and Round III

Means ($\bar{X}$) and standard deviation (sd) from Round II and Round III

Order	Activity	RII $\bar{X}$	RII (sd)	RIII $\bar{X}$	RIII (sd)
1.	encouraging*	7.9	(1.4)	8.2	(0.9)
2.	counseling	7.7	(1.5)	8.1	(1.1)
3.	modeling	7.4	(1.4)	8.1	(1.2)
4.	having informal discussions	8.0	(1.0)	8.0	(0.8)
5.	mentor observing intern	7.6	(1.2)	7.4	(0.8)
6.	**orienting intern to staff and district****	7.1	(1.7)	7.4	(1.1)
7.	intern observing mentor	7.4	(1.6)	7.4	(1.3)
8.	befriending	7.1	(1.6)	7.0	(1.4)
9.	participating in workshops/ seminars	6.8	(1.8)	6.9	(1.6)
10.	joint planning	6.9	(1.6)	6.8	(1.2)
11.	reviewing materials for teaching	6.8	(1.4)	6.8	(1.2)
12.	**attending conferences together****	6.6	(2.0)	6.7	(1.7)
13.	holding routine formal discussions	6.1	(2.0)	6.4	(1.5)
14.	teaching together	6.6	(1.9)	6.4	(1.5)
15.	teaching the intern	6.0	(2.0)	6.0	(1.4)
16.	**social events****	4.7	(2.0)	4.6	(1.7)

Note: Round II (n=65)
Round III (n=48)

*Activities were placed in descending order according to the group means from Round III.

** Bold-faced type indicates the activities that were added by participants in Round I.

Table 3
Other Activities -- Comparison of the Results from Round II and Round III

Means ($\bar{X}$) and standard deviations (sd) from Round II and Round III.

Order	Activity	RII $\bar{X}$	RII (sd)	RIII $\bar{X}$	RIII (sd)
				8.0	
1.	**mentor training program*, ****	7.6	(1.4)	7.8	(0.9)
2.	intern observing other teachers	7.6	(1.5)	7.7	(1.2)
3.	meeting with other mentors	7.3	(2.2)	6.9	(1.7)
4.	mentor attending workshops/ seminars	6.7	(2.0)	6.9	(1.7)
5.	**informal meetings with other mentors****	6.7	(1.8)	6.8	(1.4)
6.	sponsoring the intern	6.4	(2.0)	6.7	(1.5)
7.	attending state or regional conferences	6.4	(2.0)	6.4	(1.7)
8.	mentor visiting other schools	6.1	(2.0)	6.4	(1.6)
9.	**reading about mentoring****	5.9	(2.0)	6.1	(1.4)
10.	**mentor sharing at faculty meetings****	5.6	(2.1)	5.8	(1.4)
11.	attending national conferences	5.6	(2.1)	5.8	(1.8)

Note: Round II (n=65)
Round III (n=48)

* The activities were arranged in descending order according to the mean from Round III.

** Bold-faced type indicates the activities that were added by participants in Round I.

Table 4
Elements of Overall Project Structure -- Comparison of the Results of Round II and Round III

Means (X) and standard deviations (sd) from Round II and Round III.

Order	Element	RII X	RII (sd)	RIII X	RIII (sd)
1.	effective pre-planning * for the project	7.8	(1.5)	8.1	(1.0)
2.	**administrative support for the project**	7.7	(1.9)	8.0	(1.5)
3.	effective matching of mentors and interns	7.8	(1.4)	7.9	(1.3)
4.	**clearly defined roles for for participants**	7.7	(1.6)	7.9	(1.2)
5.	cooperation by teachers/ administrators	7.3	(1.8)	7.7	(1.3)
6.	leadership from project coordinators	7.1	(2.0)	7.6	(1.1)
7.	clear roles from principals/ supervisors	6.8	(2.2)	7.4	(1.3)
8.	**roles for previous mentors and interns****	7.1	(1.8)	7.2	(1.4)
9.	effective project introduction into the community	6.5	(2.2)	6.9	(1.4)
10.	use of consultants	6.4	(1.8)	6.7	(1.4)
11.	year-long steering committee	6.2	(1.8)	6.6	(1.1)

Note: Round II (n=65)
Round III (n=48)

* Elements were placed in descending order according to the group means from Round III.

** Bold-faced type indicates the elements that were added by participants in Round I.

Table 5
Elements of Project Support for Mentors -- Comparison of the Results of Round II and Round III

Means ($\bar{X}$) and standard deviations (sd) from Round II and Round III.

Order	Element	RII $\bar{X}$	RII (sd)	RIII $\bar{X}$	RIII (sd)
1.	adequate release time*	8.1	(1.7)	8.5	(0.7)
2.	orientation for the mentors	8.1	(1.4)	8.4	(0.7)
3.	satisfactory substitute arrangements	7.9	(1.9)	8.3	(1.2)
4.	**union support****	7.2	(1.9)	7.8	(1.2)
5.	joint meetings with other mentors	7.4	(1.6)	7.7	(1.2)
6.	**availability of project leader****	7.3	(1.8)	7.7	(1.0)
7.	**informal networks with other mentors****	7.1	(1.9)	7.5	(1.1)
8.	seminars on mentoring	7.2	(1.9)	7.5	(1.6)
9.	**acceptance of other teachers****	7.2	(1.5)	7.4	(1.1)
10.	sufficient materials on mentoring	7.1	(1.7)	7.1	(1.3)
11.	attendance at conferences	6.5	(1.9)	6.6	(1.6)
12.	networks with other projects in area	6.2	(2.1)	6.3	(1.7)
13.	mentors received special recognition	5.5	(2.3)	5.7	(1.9)
14.	preferred treatment in materials order	4.7	(2.2)	4.7	(2.0)

Note: Round II (n=65)
Round III (n=48)

* The elements were arranged in descending order according to the mean from Round III.

** Bold-faced type indicates the elements that were added by participants in Round I.

APPENDIX B

Panelists

This list presents forty of the forty-eight panelists who contributed to each of the three rounds of this study. Those listed granted their permission to include their names in this study. The wishes of the eight who did not desire to have their names included have been respected. A special admiration and gratitude is felt for each mentor whose reflections made this study possible.

Linda Barbato
James C. Boardman
Ruth B. Bonn
Joan Brown
N. J. Cenerelli
Marilyn Compo
John Cosgriff
Jonetta Darcy
Barbara Davis
Jacquelyn Dawson
Marcia DeFran
Rosalyn Della Pietra
John Donovan
Mary N. Drachler
Terri Drossos
Mildred Farinella
Diane L. Fortman
Rosemary B. Frenyea
Joan Grossman
Sam Hammond
Jean Hakinian
Patricia Jones
Deborah Leff
William Lutz
Anne Mielenhausen
Connie M. Miller
Jamie Moessel
Carl E. O'Connell
John D. Parry
John Pelkey
Karene Person
Johanna Peterson
Marianne J. Schaffner
Gloria Sena
Gerald T. Sherman
Daphine Somerville
Al Stevens
Marilyn Stuzin
Costance M. Wang
Jeanne Wells

Selected References

Alleman, E. (1986). Measuring mentoring-frequency quality impact. Gray, W. A. & Gray, M. M. (Eds.). Mentoring: Aid to excellence in career development, business and the professions. p. 44-51. British Columbia: The Xerox Reproduction Centre.

Clemson, R. (1987). Mentorship in teaching. Action In Teacher Education, 9(3), 85-90.

Corsi, S. (1986). Request for Proposals and Application Materials: Mentor Teacher-Internship Program. State Education Department, Albany, NY.

DeBolt, G. (1989). Helpful elements in the mentoring of first-year teachers. Unpublished dissertation: Syracuse University.

Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1986). Mentoring among teachers; A review of the literature. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(1), 6-11.

Gehrke, N. (1988, August). Toward a definition of mentoring. Theory Into Practice, 27(3), p. 190-194.

Gehrke, N. (1988). On preserving the essence of mentoring as one form of teacher leadership. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(1), p. 43-45.

Gehrke, N. & Kay, R. (1984). The socialization of beginning teachers through mentor-protege relationships. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(3), p. 21-24.

Heath, A., Neimeyer, J., & Pedersen, P. (1988). The future of cross-cultural counseling: A delphi poll. Journal of Counseling and Development, 67(9), p. 27-30.

Hoffman, J., Edwards, S., O'Neal, S., Barnes, S., & Paulissen, M. (1986). A study of state-mandated beginning teacher programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 38(1), 16-21.

Mager, G., Bower, A., Corwin, C., Davis, M., & DeBolt, G. (1987). A Report to the State Education Department on the New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program for 1986-1987. Unpublished manuscript.

Mager, G. (1988, April). New teacher induction through mentoring. Syracuse, N.Y. Unpublished manuscript.

Mager, G., & Corwin, C. (1988, November). A report to the State Education Department on the New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program for 1987-1988: The mentor-intern relationship. Syracuse, N.Y. Unpublished manuscript.

Noe, R. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships. Personnel Psychology, 41, 457-479.

Phillips-Jones, L. (1983). Establishing a formalized mentoring program. Training and Development Journal, February, 38-42.

Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1986). A collaborative approach for mentor training: A working model. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(6), 13-20.

Zimpher, N., & Rieger, S. (1988). Mentoring teachers: What are the issues? Theory Into Practice, 27(3), 175-181.